

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 18-7090-CAS (GJSx)	Date	November 22, 2019
Title	DMF Inc. v. AMP Plus Inc., et al.		

Present: The Honorable	GAIL J. STANDISH, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
E. Carson	N/A		
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder		
Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s):	Attorneys Present for Defendant(s):		
None present	None present		

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER RE PARTIES' EMAILS OF NOVEMBER 21, 2019

The Court is in receipt of two e-mails from counsel seeking Pre-Discovery Motion telephonic conferences with the Court pursuant to the Court's procedures, both of which are dated Thursday, November 21, 2019. Both e-mails concern discovery issues: one of them is directed to certain Requests for Admission, and the other seeks clarification of a prior Court order issued after a hearing on October 16, 2019. The Discovery Cutoff in this case expired nearly three weeks ago, on November 4, 2019. The District Judge's order in this case defines the Discovery Cutoff as follows:

4. **DISCOVERY CUTOFF:** Generally, the Court will set a discovery cutoff date at the scheduling conference. The Court expects that by the date of the discovery cutoff, all discovery and responses thereto shall have been served, and all motions to compel will be on file and have been argued (but not necessarily decided). The only discovery that may be conducted after the discovery cutoff date without leave of Court is discovery ordered by the Magistrate Judge for which a timely-filed motion was pending and argued before the discovery cutoff date.

Initials of Preparer

_____:_____
efc

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 18-7090-CAS (GJSx)	Date	November 22, 2019
Title	DMF Inc. v. AMP Plus Inc., et al.		

Unless the Court has issued a contrary order, all discovery motions should be set before the Magistrate Judge to whom this case is assigned.

Given Judge Snyder's Order, the Court no longer has jurisdiction to hear disputes regarding the RFAs raised in the parties' e-mail.

The issue concerning the Court's prior discovery order, however, may be considered because the issue was raised, argued, and, in fact, decided before the cutoff. The issue presented to the Court is whether the Court's issued minute order or the order as stated on the record controls. The Court has reviewed the transcript excerpt provided and agrees that the order as summarized in the later-filed minute order incorrectly sets forth the Court's final ruling. The transcript clearly demonstrates the Court's intent. The Court's order as stated on the record therefore controls.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

_____:_____
efc